DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 578 EA 025 041

AUTHOR Harisun, Marelle
TITLE Social Justice Resource Schools: A Case Study of a School Effectiveness Strategy.
PUB DATE Jan 91
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement (4th, Cardiff, Wales, January 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Action Research; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Leadership; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; *Program Improvement; *School Effectiveness; Social Action
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (South Australia)

ABSTRACT

This paper traces one example of area support for schools to show how an administrator can initiate school-effectiveness work. The paper describes the implementation of an intervention plan for social justice and improved educational outcomes for aboriginal students, the Social Justice Resource Schools (SJRS) program, which was established in the western area of South Australia. An analysis of the initiation and implementation phases suggests that the program and schools have incorporated all the factors for effective initiation at a satisfactory level. The leadership roles necessary for moving from policy to implementation include building a vision, taking the initiative, empowering participants, procuring funding, and coping with problems. This case study demonstrates that it is possible for an educational administrator to conduct action research on initiating a major policy implementation program, to model the implementation processes, and to facilitate school improvement through action research. One table is included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SOCIAL JUSTICE RESOURCE SCHOOLS
A CASE STUDY OF A SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS STRATEGY.

Marelle Harisun

ED358578

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Harisun

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 025 041

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOCIAL JUSTICE RESOURCE SCHOOLS
A CASE STUDY OF A SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS STRATEGY.

Marelle Harisun

INTRODUCTION

In 1983, School Development as a process for whole school professional development based on major change priorities was introduced into South Australia by the Professional Development Committee of the Commonwealth Schools Commission in that state. By 1986, the approach was generally used in schools in the Western Area of that state, and was linked to one year action plans for implementing these priorities. Schools were encouraged by District Superintendents of Schools and the administration of the Area to prepare priorities for curriculum, resource usage, school structure change, and interpersonal processes for a three year period. By 1989, the South Australian Education Department had adopted School Development Plans (three year agendas for change) for the state system, Areas, and schools. The Education Review Unit was established to review on a three year cycle the achievement of these plans by each school and operating unit. Western Area had based their planning on a set of priorities with related action plans since 1985. During 1989, the Area Management asked schools to present their draft School Development Plans to guide Area planning. The Assistant Director, Curriculum and Student Services, analysed the stated priorities and reported these to management and schools under the major curriculum and other focuses listed on the first draft of the system's Three Year Plan, and according to schools' location in the six districts. This summary was used to guide the operations of the District Office and Area support staff (superintendents and consultants) in their work with schools on implementing and reviewing their plans. Throughout this entire period, the administration of the Western Area has placed a major emphasis on schools managing whole school change for improved learning outcomes, and as the principal as the major facilitator of such change (Harisun, 1986). This paper will trace one example of Area support for schools as an illustration of how an administrator can take the initiative in school effectiveness/development work.

SOCIAL JUSTICE AS A FOCUS IN WESTERN AREA

In 1988, I became the Assistant Director, Curriculum and Student Services in Western Area, and identified action for social justice and improved educational outcomes for Aboriginal students within that focus as my major priority for working with schools. A Social Justice Committee was established to advise me of the major priorities and assist in developing action plans to achieve desired outcomes. Each school was asked to identify a Social Justice contact person, who was provided with resource materials about social justice for informing their school community. District networks of schools focusing on training and development for social justice began to operate by 1989, when the Training and Development Committee identified Social Justice as one of

ED 340 850 041

their three major priorities for funding activities in 1990-92. During 1989, the Area's Social Justice Strategic Plan was developed, and a Project Plan included in the Area's Three Year Plan for 1990-2. The analysis of School Development Plans (SDPs) in January 1990 revealed that social justice was the major priority on school plans for the same period. Late in 1989, the Area agreed to the appointment of a Social Justice Consultant and a Parent-Student Participation Consultant to work with the Assistant Director (ADCASS) to implement the Project Plan.

The Area Plan identified poverty linked with isolation and Aboriginal education as two of the three priorities, the other being equitable resource allocation within and to Western Area. The Area Office team then developed their Performance Improvement Plans focused on achieving the goals/outcomes of the strategic plan. ADCASS and the SJ Consultant worked together to develop the concept of the strategy detailed below.

AN AREA-WIDE INTERVENTION STRATEGY

The SJ Consultant (Wendy Teasdale) was detailed to coordinate the work of the larger Social Justice team (Disadvantaged Schools, Aboriginal Education, Parent-Student Participation and Health Education teams) as the people to implement the SJ Project Plan. The ADCASS set down a clear definition of Social Justice as it was understood by Western Area (see Appendix A), and this formed the introduction to the Social Justice Strategic Plan launched during the year and distributed free to schools.

A major priority within the plan was to establish Social Justice Resource Schools across the Area, as a major intervention to encourage schools in implementing their major priority in this focus area. The ADCASS saw this strategy as action research on her and the consultant's role in taking the initiative for social justice and improved learning outcomes for "disadvantaged" students. As the selected schools were to be asked to implement action research, the initiators were modelling what they would ask schools to do.

The RATIONALE underpinning the concept of Social Justice Resource Schools (SJRS) was based on research conducted by Harisun, 1986 and Miles, 1989 identifying the following factors in successful school change/improvement efforts:

- o The change cycle is 3-5 years;
- o Change proceeds in phases of initiation, implementation and institutionalisation;
- o The school principal is the key facilitator of change;
- o The principal needs to perform key leadership functions in managing change successfully;
- o Action research as a process of reflecting on experience is one of the most powerful processes for change;

Social Justice action was seen as needing to be directed to whole school change. The Area has increasingly taken initiatives in implementing strategies to support schools in moving from central policies to practice. This focus was seen as critical in having schools ready for system initiatives for social justice, and in assisting schools to clearly target groups of learners who needed curriculum interventions to enable them to achieve more equitable outcomes. It was clear that schools in the past two decades had put much effort into educating disadvantaged students, with support from national and state programs, but that much of the effort had been "scatter shot", lacking rigour and not achieving the desired gains in attainment of these students or their access to employment choices.

The CONCEPT was developed by Harisun and Teasdale to encompass three phases.

1. INITIATION PHASE

In this phase, Area support staff (approximately 70 in number) would be trained in social justice concepts, and action research processes. Schools would be selected from volunteers who had social justice already on their SDP, committed themselves to three years as a resource school, identified three people as the management team, and committed themselves to the training program as well as conducting action research related to a particular target group they specified from those listed (girls, Aborigines, students experiencing poverty, disability, isolation or of non-English speaking background). The schools were to be spread across the Area geographically, and be selected to include a close-to proportionally representative sample of types and sizes of schools. The schools once selected were then to attend a two day conference to be trained in relation to social justice understandings, the needs of specific target groups, and in action research processes. Schools would develop before they left the conference an action plan for consulting with their school community to prepare an agreed action research plan. Schools also met in groups according to their target group and in districts to plan their support and information exchange during the year.

2. IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

The Implementation Phase would occur throughout 1990 and beyond, as schools negotiated and implemented their action research, documented the processes and outcomes for sharing with other schools and across the Area, and linked with the District Office support staff who assisted them in carrying out their agreed role. District networks were to be facilitated by DEO staff, and funded with T&D money for travel and accommodation costs. At the end of 1990, schools were to meet for a further two days to report on their processes and outcomes, and receive further training for becoming resource schools for other schools in their districts with a social justice focus in 1991.

3. INSTITUTIONALISATION PHASE

In this phase, the aim was to have all Western Area schools addressing social justice through targeting a specific group of students with low achievement. District networks and T&D would continue, supported by Area/District staff and the key people in the resource schools. All schools would have social justice on their SDP. The results of these efforts would be documented , and meta analysis conducted to identify the factors making for success or otherwise, and to share strategies across the state. Schools would then be equipped to demonstrate to the Education Review Unit that they had achieved their stated outcomes for this priority of their SDP.

THE PLAN IN ACTION

1. INITIATION PHASE

Area staff were trained in a two day staff meeting, as planned, and returned to their year's work with district and team action plans to support social justice. They agreed that they would be a major support to the selected schools in their training and role implementation. Teams "talked up" the idea of SJRSs in their work during first term 1990, encouraging schools to consider applying to enter the program.

Schools were circularised and invited to apply to be a SJRS, with full details of the requirements they would have to meet. The proposed five schools per district was exceeded in terms of interested schools, and a selection committee culled applications according to stated criteria, identifying 27 schools. See Appendix B for details of types and locations of schools. Three districts were over-represented, as they had the largest number of identified "Priority Project"/"disadvantaged" schools. The sixth district of Aboriginal schools had no applicants at this stage, and the Superintendent was approached to seed the idea with these schools on his visits with his support staff. During third term four of these schools were selected, and one other withdrew, leaving 30 schools in the program.

The T&D Social Justice Conference was held, with the support of the Social Justice Team and all Area support staff in key roles. The planned focuses were achieved, and schools returned with school, target group and network action plans for second term. Most schools had sent three representatives, with a small number of parents included. Students from the Western Area Council of Students also attended along with some members of the Parent Education Advisory Committee. Schools were given a clear message that their first task was to collect data on the real (not perceived) needs of their target group of students, and develop a rigorous plan for addressing those needs. They had the beginnings of an action plan ready for negotiation in some cases. A small number of school groups included the principal, even though all had been asked to do so and committed themselves to this in their application. Principals indicated that they had been required to be out of their schools for a system-wide T&D program too much for a further absence.

2. IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

Schools returned to negotiate their action research, after undertaking their situation analysis. They sent copies of their action plans to the coordinators (ADCASS,SJ Consultant) by mid-second term. A small planning committee designed a school profile form and a needs assessment instrument, to assist in planning the second conference (November 29-30) so that skills electives would match stated needs.

While schools implemented their plans, DEO and Area staff became involved in their processes and assisted with three district network conferences around social justice. All district networks functioned and were supported with T&D funding. Prior to attending the second conference, schools were contacted with instructions about their preparation for reporting on their results. Each target group was allocated a different colour and asked to use it in preparing their displays around twelve keys to social justice - twelve issues to be answered by the whole school community in a 4-9 p.m. workshop reflecting on their experience. These twelve issues were:

We negotiated our action research plan with the school community by using these processes;

- o We collected information on the present situation of our target group using these methods;
- o We involved parents in identifying the actual needs of the target group using these methods;
- o We involved students in identifying the actual needs of the target group using these methods;
- o The priorities we set for our action research were;
- o The outcomes we specified for the target group were;
- o We used these strategies to intervene in learning processes to achieve the outcomes;
- o The indicators of success we set were;
- o We used these methods for collecting information on the outcomes or indicators of success;
- o The actual outcomes/indicators of success we identified and celebrate were
  - for students
  - for parents
  - for staff
- o When we reflected on the action research used, the helping factors in our success were seen to be;
- o When we reflected on the action research, the blocks to success were seen to be.

At the conference, schools set up their displays, reported to each other in target groups of schools, and then to the total conference group. Support staff assisted with the analysis of the reported results in the target groups, and shared the reflection results so that all participants could move around to hear the reports. Meta analysis was conducted using the Miles (1989) factors relating to success as the focus. The

complexity of social injustice (a request from participants) was addressed with a play written and presented by the students of one of the secondary schools in the program, with guided reflection to identify the issues for schools arising from same. Information was given about the newly prepared system Social Justice Strategic Plan targeting attendance, participation and attainment of specific disadvantaged students, and participants asked to include this more rigourous approach in their next action research cycle. Schools again had time to plan their next stage, and to work in district groups to plan ongoing support and later support for other schools in their group. They requested a further area conference in late 1991, to report on the 1991 processes and outcomes.

There was a noticeable increase in the number of principals attending with their teams in this later conference, despite the continuing pressure for them to be out of their schools for system T&D events.

Schools were asked to supply a typed record of their answers to the twelve issues, for later analysis by the coordinators. Eleven such records have been used as the basis of this report. Overall analysis will be conducted early in 1991, for further reporting back to the schools through the Area publication "Dialogue".

RESULTS

One of the major results of the program in relation to a strategy for managing change is that every school was at a different stage in their action research at the end of 1990, even though they all began on the program at the same time. Approximately half of the schools had completed one cycle of action research, and the others were at various stages. Factors impacting on this variety were changes of principal, a state-wide industrial action campaign that meant many schools "worked to rule", only undertaking classroom teaching. Four schools had just been accepted into the program, and will begin their planning in first term 1991. One school had withdrawn, because of changing their priorities on their SDP.

1. NEGOTIATING THEIR ACTION RESEARCH

Most of the schools (81.8%) had conducted a participatory process with staff for planning their research. Three quarters of the schools had appointed a special cross-hierarchical team to coordinate the research. Twenty seven different approaches were reported, with all being participatory in nature. Staff as a whole were reported to own the action research plan. The plans themselves had already been linked to a priority on the SDP. Parent and student participation in this stage of the process was not high, though the schools focusing on Aboriginal students had generally involved their Aboriginal Education Workers (AEWs) in consulting with parents.

2. SITUATION ANALYSIS REGARDING THE TARGET GROUP

Thirty eight different techniques were used by these schools to obtain data on the needs of their target group. In order of frequency of type of approach they were:

- o data records in relation to specific indicators; interviews with parents, students and staff;
- o questionnaires and surveys;
- o action research methods, mainly descriptive;
- o discussion
- o home visits; qualitative methods;
- o meetings with small groups; checklists of specific behaviours;
- o meetings with parent bodies; phone calls; communication through networks; children writing about the issue.

Formal methods were three times more frequently reported than informal methods. The overall impression is of a group of people committed to obtaining data specific to the target group, in "objective" ways, though the emphasis was still on obtaining people's perceptions of the needs rather than using outcome indicators. Some schools whose reports are not yet presented to the coordinators did use specific outcome measures, with observation at regular intervals.

3. PARENT PARTICIPATION IN IDENTIFYING NEEDS

Seven of the eleven schools reported parent participation in the needs identification process. Methods used were, in order of frequency of report, interviews, special meetings, committees already in existence, individual discussion, surveys/action research participation/parent-teacher regular contact/newsletter items, peer contact. One school had involved parents in the formal review of their learning centre for Aboriginal students. Another had trained a parent to interview all parents about the issues, using a variety of methods with which the parents felt comfortable. Another school had involved parents in interviewing students. Despite the pressure from the coordinators to involve parents in all stages of their action research, not all schools had felt ready or motivated to do so. Two schools, however, had involved parents in all stages of the action research process.

4. STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN IDENTIFYING NEEDS

All eleven schools reported involving students in the assessment of needs. All schools had used interviews with students to identify needs. Other methods used, in order of frequency of report, were through the Student Representative Council/surveys, peer contact/observation, special meetings/written feedback about a program/students surveying parents/a special event (National Aboriginal Day celebrations). Twenty one different techniques were used to have students participate in this stage. The schools focusing on Aboriginal students used the more creative approaches.

5. PRIORITIES FOR ACTION RESEARCH

As could be expected, schools identified a great variety of priorities (38) for their action research projects, with each school having an average of 3.5 priorities. These ranged from having Aboriginal parents and students make an impact on the decision-making and priority setting of the school community, through affecting racist discrimination throughout the school, affecting positively student and parent perceptions of career options, having girls become more assertive and successful in maths/science/physical education, raising attainment levels of "at risk" students, to making a measurable improvement in Aboriginal literacy levels. Almost half of the reported priorities related to changing staff behaviours. The same proportion related to achieving outcomes for students, while approximately one sixth related to outcomes for parents. One school set a priority of improving school-community relationships. All except one of the priorities were specific and observable, though many required skills in qualitative evaluation to identify achievement.

6. SPECIFIED OUTCOMES

Thirty nine different outcomes were specified by the eleven schools, an average of 3.5 per school. All outcomes were written in terms that made them observable, though again a large proportion depended on skills in collecting qualitative data, and some on having baseline data available to make comparisons possible. Almost two thirds (21) of the outcomes related to students, and one third to staff, while four outcomes related to parents. Some examples of outcomes statements are:

- o the Aboriginal student body meets in lesson time and this is valued as part of their curriculum;
- o regular attendance of Aboriginal students;
- o increased retention rates for Aboriginal students;
- o data collected about student career choice and writing topics;
- o decrease level of harassment;
- o girls have/make more responsible playtime choices;
- o girls have increased airspace in the class;
- o teachers are evaluating their methodologies;
- o there is a budget for work with the target group.

7. INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

Forty six different intervention strategies were reported by the eleven schools, an average of 4.2 per school. More than two thirds (37%) of the strategies related to classroom methodology. More than two fifths (22%) detailed a special program for the target group. Slightly fewer schools had made a curriculum change. Other strategies included parent/student participation strategies, changes to the structure of the school, allocation of resources, training and development, and ongoing evaluation of attainment. All strategies were consistent with the stated priorities.

8. INDICATORS OF SUCCESS

Thirty nine different indicators of success were specified by the eleven schools, an average of 3.5 per school. In order of frequency of mention these covered the following types:

- o student participation in learning (66%);
- o parent participation in learning processes (15.4%);
- o increases in student attendance;
- o getting the specific priority into the SDP and the action plan complete;
- o increased student attainment levels.

Again, the indicators though written in observable terms depended on qualitative evaluation skills and/or having baseline data for comparison. Schools have not yet placed a major focus on attainment gains, perhaps because they feel they lack skill in this area, or because this is the first action research cycle and their focus will become more specific over time.

9. DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

Thirty four different data collection techniques were reported by the eleven schools, an average of 3.0 per school. In order of frequency of reports for type of technique, these were:

- o face to face methods (23.5%);
- o statistical records (20.5%);
- o written/formal evaluation; anecdotal/qualitative/observation (14.7%);
- o surveys/questionnaires/checklists; student feedback; staff reflection on outcomes (11.7%);
- o pre/post methods; visual and audio-visual records; ongoing action research;
- o artefacts (student work).

10. ACTUAL OUTCOMES

A great variety of outcomes for students, parents and staff were reported by the eleven schools. Table 1 summarises these for group and type of outcome.

Table 1: Outcomes as reported by the schools

OUTCOME	STUDENTS	PARENTS	STAFF	TOTAL
Affective	7	2	10	19
Intellectual/ achievement	9	3	9	21
Attendance	2	2	0	4
Participation	11	7	5	23
Resource Allocation	-	1	-	1
TOTALS	29	15	24	68

The reports indicated that schools had made the greatest achievements in participation of students, parents and staff, with almost as much achievement in relation to attainment for all groups, then in affective outcomes mainly with staff (changed attitudes and levels of commitment). These stated outcomes are consistent with the emphases in the planned indicators of success.

A few schools whose reports have not yet been received illustrated the outcomes of their research in graphs demonstrating that they had focused on a specific indicator and quantified it at intervals. The results showed conclusive evidence that their interventions had resulted in a decrease in undesirable outcomes and an associated increase in desirable outcomes. One of these schools demonstrated an increase in on-task classroom behaviour in Aboriginal students, and a decrease in aggressive behaviour in yard and classroom.

11. FACTORS HELPING WITH THE ACTION RESEARCH PROCESS

Schools reported on 55 different factors related to their action research. These have been categorised according to the Harisun (1986) model of the school as an organisation. In order of frequency of report they were:

- o people /interpersonal processes (37.2%);
- o use of human resources (16.3%);
- o leadership/vision/planning (14.5%);

- o curriculum processes (12.7%);
- o community participation (10.9%);
- o school structure (7.2%);
- o non-human resources;
- o district network activities.

The three most frequently mentioned categories illustrate the major impact on managing change of people and the processes they engage in for communication, decision-making, sharing values, teamwork and relationship building. It is noteworthy that schools did not cite physical/monetary resources as a major helping factor, despite the fact that school staffs generally will assert that they cannot implement policy without the system supplying additional resources.

12. HINDERING FACTORS

Thirty three different hindering factors were reported by the eleven schools. Again these were categorised according to the Harisun model. In order of frequency of report these were:

- o people/interpersonal processes (36.4%);
- o non-human resources, especially lack of time and time management (21.2%);
- o structure of the school (15.1%);
- o community participation and issues (12.1%);
- o lack of leadership/vision/planning (6.0%);
- o lack of human resources; lack of networking (3.0%).

People/interpersonal processes again proved to be the most frequently perceived blockages to implementing the action research. Lack of time or poor time management, as is usual, was reported as a blockage. It is noteworthy that lack of human resources (adequate staff) is very low in mention as a blockage. This may be because most of these schools have been allocated social justice salaries for specific target groups by the Education Department, and additionally some have received Priority Project Program funding to provide for additional human resources.

OVERALL ANALYSIS

At the conference, the schools were asked to use the Miles (1989) factors relating to successful implementation of policy to evaluate the reported data. Their analysis, and the writer's reflection on the data reported here, shows that the program and schools have built in all the factors associated with effective initiation at a satisfactory level, apart from the factor of "stable leadership" in schools. Schools in Western Area experience up to a third staff turnover each year, as staff return to the metropolitan area or/and win promotion positions in other schools. At the implementation stage, the schools and the coordinators considered that most of the factors associated with success were present at a satisfactory level, though more work needs to be done on

- o stable leadership (with the above proviso);
- o a mostly active, initiating leadership style from the principal;
- o willingness to cope at a deep level with problems;
- o flexible financial resources.

The ADCASS and SJ Consultant will need to address these issues in 1991, in their training of DEO and Area support staff. Flexible financial resources are now available for 1991 to schools, who have the ability to transfer their staffing allocation into teaching, ancillary, hourly paid instructor or teacher release time. Other Area resources available to support schools are also able to be converted to meeting travel and other contingency expenses. Principals will need assistance in maximising this flexibility.

In order to make action for social justice institutionalised successfully much work remains to be done. Some of the factors are already in place, such as

- o built in, believable evaluation (1991 evaluation conference)
- o resource allocation;
- o tied into other change efforts (such as the system's Social Justice Strategic Plan, and soon to be trialled attainment levels for all curriculum areas);
- o tie in to classroom instruction;
- o tie into curriculum;
- o widespread use (through district network plans);
- o removal of competing pressures (through not asking these schools to undertake any other tasks for the system);
- o mandate (through the requirement that all schools will include the SJ Strategic Plan in their 1992-4 SDP);
- o an adequate bank of local assistance people (over 100 people have been trained as resource/support people for 110 other schools);
- o networking and peer support (integral to the program).

Stable program leadership will occur through the continuing appointment of the SJ Consultant and Parent-Student Participation Consultant, and several district office support staff. The ADCASS continuation is dependent on the outcomes of the current restructuring of the Education Department, ordered by the state government.

The role of ADCASS as initiator/leader of this area-wide change effort has matched the Miles (1989) delineation of necessary leadership roles in moving from policy to implementation. These are summarised below.

1. VISION BUILDING

This was done through defining social justice, the preparation of the SJ strategic and project plans and their dissemination to schools, the analysis of SDPs and its dissemination, the management of the T&D priorities and funds to address social justice, the sharing of the concept with key people across the area, and placing

weekly reports about specific school-based initiatives for social justice in the Western Area Gazette distributed to schools and School Councils.

2. PRESSURE AND INITIATIVE

All of the above exerted pressure. Schools were invited to participate but within clearly specified requirements that exerted pressure on them to a three year commitment to their role. District/area teams were given a priority to support these schools as their 1990 task. Schools were required to document and evaluate their efforts, after preparing a detailed action research plan that was supplied to ADCASS on an agreed timeline.

3. EMPOWERMENT

Each school was asked to designate their own target group, and their specific focus. They prepared their own action research plans within guidelines. Each district has its own plan for supporting each other and for providing support to other schools within and beyond the district. Each school has proceeded at its own pace, and the variety of implementation has been legitimised by ADCASS at the 1990 conference. Support from the coordinators in 1991 will be tied to the specific plans of the district groups of schools. All of these actions are calculated to empower people and make them independent and interdependent, rather than dependent on the Area management of the program.

4. ASSISTANCE

Assistance has been provided to the schools through special T&D funding for both conferences, being provided with special T&D funds, regular information and readings to challenge thinking, each school being allocated a consultant to work with them long term, support of the SJ team for schools, the provision of guidelines for action research, and provision of SJ resource kits to each school.

5. PROBLEM-COPING

This has been provided through the constant support of the DEO staff, through phone contact, publishing examples of good practice, visits to the schools by the coordinators, and provision of specific assistance to problem-solving on request. As trends in problems were discerned, the coordinators developed strategies to solve them rather than to deal with them superficially. However, most of the problems will and have occurred at the local school level, and principals will need to be further skilled in problem-coping at the deep level, so that this aspect of leadership for change may be more effective. ADCASS will need to utilise any flexible resourcing she has to address the factors that have hindered success, such as salary to provide release time for documenting, analysing, and to focus the 1991 conference on writing the case study reports, rather than expecting schools to come equipped with a final report.

Training will need to be provided to support staff and through them to principals in evaluation skills for collecting baseline data and qualitative methods, as this appears to be a major problem area across most of the schools. This training will begin in late February at the Area Staff Meeting.

SUMMARY

This case study illustrates that it is possible for an educational administrator to conduct action research on initiating a major policy implementation program, to model the processes that are involved in that implementation, and to facilitate schools working to improve learning outcomes for lower achieving students through rigorous action research. It has shown up the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation, and provided important guidance for the next stage of implementation and for the institutionalising stage of the process.

I personally have undertaken a much more up-front role in this priority than in any other initiative within the Area, and have learned that I can balance being assertive and directive with working to empower school staffs to own policy implementation. The paradox and tension in this process of providing both pressure and support has been one of the most exciting challenges I have ever experienced as an educator. I look forward to the longer term analyses of the program and its learnings, and to further sharing of the processes and outcomes with others interested in school effectiveness/improvement.

REFERENCES

Harisun, M. (Ed) (1986) School Development Resources (Books 1-9), Adelaide, Commonwealth Schools Commission Professional Development Programme.

Miles, M. (1989) Research findings on the stages of school improvement, Paper presented to a conference with South Australian Education Department officers, Adelaide (May).

SOCIAL JUSTICE : A DEFINITION (Harisun, 1990)

LEGAL JUSTICE : Laws, rules, regulations to provide for equal rights and responsibilities for all individuals in society
(eg. Equal opportunities, sexist/racist harassment policies and procedures)

DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE : Redistributing human/material resources according to need.
(eg. Social Justice salaries on top of formula by enrolment).

PARTICIPATIVE JUSTICE : Processes to enable all people to affect decisions that impact on them, to contribute to the functioning of society.

LIBERATIVE JUSTICE : Enabling/empowering all people to reach their potential

eg
(a) success in the VALUED Curriculum (to the end of Yr 12)

(b) changes to the VALUED curriculum to make it "inclusive"/socially just

RIGOUR and HIGH EXPECTATIONS

APPENDIX A